DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 938 EA 022 426

AUTHOR Goldman, Paul; Dunlap, Diane

TITLE Reform, Restructuring, Site-Based Management, and the New Face of Power in Schools.

PUB DATE Oct 90

NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (Pittsburgh, PA, October 26-28, 1990).

PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Role; Administrators; Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Human Resources; Networks; Organizational Climate; Participative Decision Making; *Power Structure; Resource Allocation; *School Based Management; *School Restructuring; Supervision

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the relationship between demands for site-based management and restructuring as they bear on recent theory and research on power in organizations. It also defines and describes the new face of power in the schools--facilitative power, power exercised through, rather than over, subordinates. The bulk of the paper consists of an attempt to show how power sharing is already in place in many current school activities. Six programs that encourage facilitative power are described: the Individual Educational Program in special education; the consultant teacher model, increasingly a component of special education delivery systems; peer consultation; cooperative learning; thematic, multidisciplinary curricula in which staff members work a specific curricular theme into the school activities; and community/alternative schools, which take curricular themes much further. These programs are discussed in relation to four characteristics of facilitative power: resource management, human resource utilization, supervision, and networking. Conclusions are that many school administrators already possess facilitative skills and knowledge and that the potential of a restructuring plan can be measured by its effect on administrators' ability to utilize facilitative power. One table accompanies the document. (45 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED325938

REFORM, RESTRUCTURING, SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT, AND THE NEW FACE OF POWER IN SCHOOLS

Paul Goldman and Diane Dunlap
University of Oregon
College of Education
Eugene, OR 97403-1215
(503) 346-5077 FAX 346-5174

Paper Presented at the Annual Meetings of the
University Council on Educational Administration
Pittsburgh, October, 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Goldman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 022 426

REFORM, RESTRUCTURING, SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT, AND THE NEW FACE OF POWER IN SCHOOLS

Paul Goldman and Diane Dunlap
University of Oregon
College of Education
Eugene, OR 97403-1215
(503) 346-5077 FAX 346-5174

Paper Presented at the Annual Meetings of the
University Council on Educational Administration
Pittsburgh, October, 1990

Reform, Restructuring, and Power (Sharing)

As the second, or is it the third, wave of educational reform rhetoric washes over the schools, "restructuring" and "site-based management" have become the watchwords of the early 1990s. They have replaced "curricular" reform, "redesign of professional education," and "instructional leadership" as priorities for change. The dramatic reorganization of Chicago's schools, in which each building is managed by an elected council of two teachers, two parents, six citizens, and the principal, provides an example of how deeply proposed restructuring may cut. At the core of this new rhetoric is power sharing: outsiders--district officials and boards--share power with insiders, administrators share power with staff and educational professionals share power with parents, students, and the public. Of course this makes educators uneasy and fearful. However, elements of their training and experience, and of many common school practices, may equip them better than they expect.

In this paper, we examine the relationship between calls for site-based management and restructuring as they bear on recent theory and research on power in organizations. We then define and describe characteristics of the new face of power--facilitative power--in schools. The bulk of the paper consists of our attempt to show how power sharing is already in place in many current school activities. Educators are already refining old skills and learning new skills and attitudes that can be applied to the "restructured" schools of the future.

As expressions, "restructuring" and "site-based management" are imprecise and confusing. Site-based management, for instance, has at least three relatively independent meanings. First, and most obvious, it implies decentralization of the decision-making process from the district to the building level, without implying how much is "enough." School districts already differ substantially in decentralization: some are controlled tightly from district or regional headquarters; in others, each school is its own "foxhole." Note, however, that decentralization *to* the school building does not necessarily imply decentralization *at* the school building. Schools already differ greatly on the extent of curriculum standardization, and teacher autonomy, so "site-based management" could have diverse meanings in different places.

Second, site-based management implies an attempt to match educational programs to specific characteristics of students, teachers, and the community in which the school is located. Site-basing implies that substantial differences in

EA 022 426

curricular strategies between school buildings, even within the same district, are not only permitted but encouraged.

Third, site-based management for many educators implies *participative* management. One of the apparent advantages of site-basing is its ability to use the knowledge and energy of participants--teachers, parents, students. Some mechanism for empowering participants is usually seen as a requirement for effecting site-based management. Restructuring can similarly be defined as occurring outside the school, inside the school, and/or inside the classroom. Calls for restructuring seldom describe what exists *before* restructuring; since schools differ so widely in their current organizational structures, it is difficult to answer the definitional question of "from what to what?"

This vagueness is typical historically of appeals for school reform; the calls to action tend to be politically and socially driven, and not specifically related either to school *status quo* or to definable measures of successful outcomes (see Bacharach, 1988). However, leaders in education ignore these general, non-data-based calls for reform at their professional peril. Among those lobbying for reform are political leaders, who accurately sensing public disenchantment with education, can tie their proposals to fundamental funding and governance issues.

Educational leaders often have difficulty incorporating the new ideas and capturing the reformers' opportunities and energy while simultaneously providing stable learning experiences for students and a viable work setting for teachers. Continuing *and* improving educational efforts simultaneously in the midst of dramatic calls for reform is especially challenging since most educators have heard these appeals before. Restructuring and site-based management is no exception. Educational leaders must understand what is being requested and why, while shielding day-to-day education from damage. We suggest in this paper that one way to understand and use the restructuring debate is to focus on power and to try to understand underlying themes about the exercise of power and using power as a resource in schools. As a rhetoric, power sharing presumes, implicitly at least, that participants can and will exercise the power they have ***through*** rather than ***over*** one another.

Facilitative Power

Power sharing has a theoretical and applied history in schools. Practitioners and academics today can learn about power by remembering what we already know. As we use the term, facilitative power is rooted in interaction, negotiation, and mutuality. It reduces tight links between power and status, minimizing claims to legitimacy based primarily on either organizational position or professional expertise. In recent literature the definition of power that results from this assumption has been described as "coactivational" by Dow (1988), as "empowerment" by Glickman (1990), and as "facilitative" by Dunlap and Goldman (1990). Facilitative power appears to be a requirement for the success of restructuring and site-based management, and differs acutely from the more commonly understood conceptualization of power as an exercise of dominance or control.

In previous work (Dunlap and Goldman, 1989; 1990) we argue that many administrators have been able to develop or refine their abilities at using facilitation as a leadership style, thus adding to their more traditional use of

hierarchical and referent/expert power as a means of accomplishing school goals. Power as a "system of facilitation" is characterized by mutuality and synergy *within* the school organization. This contrasts with characterizations of power as authority systems in which asymmetry and the ability to overcome resistance to achieve preferred outcomes dominate the literature (Abbott and Caracheo, 1987; Dornbusch, *et al.*, 1975; Muth, 1984; Pfeffer, 1981). We have suggested that facilitative power is most evident, and most appropriate, in circumstances that favor decentralization and in which educational problems appear to demand individualized solutions, e.g. site-based management and school restructuring. We discuss some such circumstances below.

Facilitative power reflects a process that, by creating or sustaining favorable conditions, allows subordinates to enhance their individual and collective performance. It is especially appropriate, even necessary, in situations where staff members must work together on new or complex tasks. In schools, administrators exercise facilitative power by engaging in any or all of four relatively distinct activities. First, they help arrange material resources that provide support for educational activities. Examples include obtaining or rearranging space, supplies, and support services, hiring substitutes or otherwise arranging to have class time covered when staff must meet during the school day, and helping staff use opportunities for professional development. Second, they select and match people who can work together effectively, paying attention to both the skills and personalities that comprise the mix. They frequently provide training for, and modeling of, collaborative behaviors. Third, administrators supervise and monitor activities, stressing feedback, reinforcement, and suggestions. It is school leaders who must provide symbolic support, especially important when activities and relationships are new and threatening, and it is they who must manage and resolve conflict. Fourth, they provide networks for activities, adding members to groups, linking groups to activities elsewhere, helping groups "go public" with activities, and diffusing new ideas.

All of these areas of facilitative power have become part of managers' repertoires in all types of organizations (Mintzberg, 1973), but they have become increasingly important for school administrators. Their domains operate in full public view and must allow extensive community and client access, elected lay boards set policies and often are involved in management, and the workforce claims professional status and insists on increased autonomy. Site-based management and school restructuring accelerate these tendencies. The frequent linkage between teacher professionalization and restructuring in educational reform rhetoric makes evident that teachers will be expected to assume responsibility. Authoritative, top-down power is inconsistent in principle with the reform rhetoric, and would not be effective where staff collaboration and creativity are need to try new ideas.

In short, administrators use facilitation to exercise power *through* subordinates--generally teachers--rather than to exercise power *over* them. In practice this means that teachers' power to determine approaches to problems they face increases, and may result in tentative solutions at variance to those administrators would select or prefer. Moreover, facilitative power expands teachers' collaborative capabilities and, by exposing them to new ventures, increases skills in other areas as well.

Facilitative power may also provide the bridge between the competing types of leadership--"transactional" and "transformational"--that Bass (1985; 1990) describes in his work. Transactional leadership is based on exchange and is driven by leaders' abilities to provide tangible career enhancement--promotions, salary increases, opportunities--to subordinates in exchange for their efforts and performance. By contrast, transformational leadership rests on interactions between charisma and transcendence. As Koh (1990: 11) puts it, "transformational leaders ...can empower their employees through leader charisma and intellectual stimulation; employee empowerment brings about changes in employees' motivation to transcend their self-interest , and enable them to perform beyond expectations." Educators encounter numerous administrator *efforts* to provide transformational leadership and symbolic management, but these wear thin over time, partially because administrators have limited control over tangible rewards. Facilitative exercise of administrator power, however, allows administrators to supply specific opportunities for challenge and career development and provide an arena for individual professional enhancement.

To examine facilitative power in contemporary schools, we have selected six examples of commonly operating programs or activities that exist in most school districts. These include (1) the I.E.P. process in special education, (2) the consultant model in special education, (3) peer consultation among teachers, (4) cooperative learning as a teaching technique, (5) thematic, multi-disciplinary curricula, and (6) community and alternative public schools. We rely heavily on our personal observations in schools and on a literature review of articles on these subjects in major educational journals during the 1980s. These sources provide enough information to draw rough inferences but we are limited because of our reliance on second-hand data analysis. Moreover, there is little actual categorical overlap between research about, and discussion of, these specific programs. Nor is there much written about these programs in the context of educational administration generally and theories of power specifically. We turn to these contemporary examples for skills already present that can direct school administrators who are experimenting with alternate forms of decision-making.

Six Examples of Programs Encouraging Facilitative Power

First, the *Individual Educational Program* in special education is unique among our examples in that passage of P.L. 94-142 brought legal issues and legal processes to the existing bureaucratic context of schools. Collaboration is essential, and is reinforced by legally mandated meetings. Program design and delivery in special education stress an almost continuously interactive process of assessment and instruction. It frequently requires the integration of interdependent, and sometimes competing, professional expertise and political interests. Typically, regular classroom teachers refer, school psychologists assess, principals facilitate, and teams consisting of several professionals place students, deliver services, and evaluate progress.

Second, the *consultant teacher model*, increasingly a component of special education delivery systems, integrates an educational philosophy (mainstreaming) with a staffing patterns that emphasize specialists working with regular education teachers and special education students *inside* mainstreamed classrooms (West and Idol, 1987). Mainstreaming in special education was bolstered by advocates for the "Regular Education Initiative" inside the Reagan

administration's (Will, 1988). Policy aside, the consultation model mainstreaming has an independent life of its own that necessarily stresses complex and subtle relationships between classroom teachers and specialists. Recent reports (Brennan and Brennan, 1988; Clarke, 1984; Westling, 1989) indicate that administrator support and leadership are essential to implement programs for special needs students in mainstream schools. Bogdan, (1983) particularly notes that failures in mainstreaming efforts frequently result from the organizational problems and internecine politics which might be alleviated by skillful facilitation. Research by Trider and Leithwood (1988) indicates specifically that special education programs require autonomous, "empowered" patterns of school leadership where school administrators have the skills to work with classroom and special education teachers to accomplish the multiple and often conflicting goals of educating special needs students.

Third, *peer consultation* models developed so that teachers can use one another's skills to improve their own teaching (Acheson and Gall, 1987; Joyce and Showers, 1987; Smith, 1990). Peer consultation generically includes master teachers working with one or more teachers, teachers rotating to observe colleagues and to be observed themselves, and strictly reciprocal peer observations involving two or three teachers. Grimmett (1987) indicates not only that principals are crucial in implementing a peer coaching program, but also that success of that program depended on the district administration's ability to empower principals as school leaders.

Fourth, *cooperative learning* has a more curricular focus, and is included here because of its increasing popularity, its apparent training requirements for teachers, and the way in which it models collaboration and facilitative power. It is especially intriguing because it requires *teachers* to take on some of the facilitative roles we are suggesting have become more common for administrators.

Fifth, *thematic, multidisciplinary curricula* include those programs, lasting anywhere from several days to several years, in which part or all of the staff works a specific curricular theme into the school's activities. Examples include such short-term projects as "China Week" or "Writing Day," as well as broader content areas and skill development activities. Whether the activities are for a day or a year, they require curricular negotiation and planning between teachers, other school staff, administrators, and (often) outsiders who may not regularly interact in curricular areas. School-wide foci also require principals to use facilitative power in exercising leadership, because creativity and innovation requiring collaboration cannot be mandated.

Sixth, *community and alternative public schools* take curricular themes much further. These school buildings or schools-within-schools range from small schools in which staff work exclusively with students in various at-risk categories to schools chosen by students and parents because they offer such focussed curricula as performing arts, language immersion, or science. Like community schools designed to bring parents and other local residents into the school buildings, alternative schools typically involve extensive participation by people who are neither staff nor students. As interest in school "choice" builds, attention to the dynamics of alternative and non-traditional school organization grows with it. Moreover, there is increasing evidence that alternative educational options improve outcomes for socially disadvantaged students, including minorities (Fantini, 1989; Lieberman, 1989). In these schools,

administrators are almost inevitably involved in curriculum and frequently collaborate, negotiate, and facilitate.

Facilitative Power and Educational Programs

In Figure 1, we present schematically the relationship of specific characteristics of facilitative power for each of the six examples identified above. Dimensions of facilitative power are arrayed vertically, the programmatic examples horizontally. In our narrative we emphasize facilitative power and incorporate examples into the characteristics of facilitative power.

In an era of severe financial constraints on the schools, ***resource management*** becomes more important than ever. A facilitative approach to power encourages leaders to invest specifically in human resources and is based on the confidence that staff will be willing and able to "repay" the investment in ways that help children learn. Focussed in-service programs, opportunities to observe colleagues in classrooms, and time for collaborative meetings are resources that principals, can provide for their staff. These activities require teachers to develop new knowledge and skills, including specific interpersonal and group interaction skills. These cannot be learned easily or effectively in university pre-service or post-service instruction; teachers and administrators need opportunities for feedback and fine-tuning as they are collaborative skills are being practiced.

Peer consultation is a good example. Teachers need specifically to learn and practice clinical supervision skills of observation and conferencing, and they must understand some basics of adult, rather than child, learning. In most peer consultation programs, training workshops take several days, and require the presence of team members and not just individuals (Smith, 1989). Workshops require a financial commitment from the school, especially if they necessitate hiring of substitutes. Furthermore, peer assessments of teaching inevitably take teachers out of classrooms for observation, and their regular responsibilities must be covered. Most research on successful peer consultation stresses that administrative support is essential, and facilitating resources is the predominant form it takes (Anastos and Ancowitz, 1987; Chase and Wolfe, 1989; Smith and Goldman, 1990).

For many of the same reasons, the consulting teacher model in special education also requires administrators to provide release time (Brennan and Brennan, 1988; Moscowitz and Lenard, 1988). As mainstreaming becomes more common in response to federal policy initiatives and educational research, teachers will have to be trained to deal with those areas where regular and special education overlap (Will, 1988). Norms and performance routines for both classroom teachers and specialists are very powerful, yet sometimes incompatible. Aside from professional courses and inservices, class visits where no "work" actually gets done may speed the learning process for both groups. A facilitative approach to power by the principal both encourages collaboration and utilizes available opportunities to increase independent collaboration.

Major curricular changes or innovations also require difficult individual and organizational learning. Multi-disciplinary curricula are frequently knowledge-based, and administrators must provide opportunities for staff not only to learn, but also to integrate, new approaches into old lessons and teaching styles. Thoughtful allocation of staff development resources serves even more

traditional programs well. One of our former students, now a middle-school principal, convinced his district to pay substitutes so grade-level teams could meet for two days in May to plan the next year's curriculum at a time when the successes and problems of the current curriculum were fresh in their minds. New curricula, especially those that are non-traditional, may also require educational materials not available at the school site or district. It becomes an administrative role to assist staff in acquiring these materials, both inside and outside the district. This is often challenging because unique materials by their very nature are cumbersome to order and more expensive than their standard counterparts, and take time if teachers prepare them for their students. Alternative schools' resource acquisition problems magnify these challenges, for new materials may be needed for all subjects and grade levels.

Budgeting is another arena where choices about how power is exercised can significantly affect whether site-based management is successful. As schools move to site-based budgeting, their gains in flexibility and responsiveness will weigh against loss of economies of scale in purchasing and increases in internal competition for resources. Administrators will be successful to the extent that they can help staff find resources beyond those nominally allocated, and can successfully negotiate equitable expenditures of the resources that are available.

Multidisciplinary projects require multidisciplinary inputs, cooperative learning is arguably enhanced by teachers who model cooperation in their interactions with peers, and special education law demands input from different specialities. The research and programmatic literature on these programs stresses collaboration. For example, Bishopp (1987), DeBlois (1989), and Whalen (1985) argue that teaming is essential for successful alternative schools generally, and especially for those dealing with at-risk students. Pugach and Johnson (1988) stress the reciprocity and mutuality of the consultancy model; their approach is ratified by Tindal (1987), Wang, et al. (1986), and Zigmund and Samsone (1986). As Smith (1989) notes , collaboration is as much an end as it is a means in peer consultation.

It should be clear that the programs we have been discussing break down the traditional isolation that occurs when teachers' professional identity consists of working alone with children in classrooms with doors literally or metaphorically shut (Lortie, 1975). In fact, teachers do work together, at least in limited ways when they serve on committees, take over one another's classes, share ideas, techniques, or insights about children. Opportunities, and requirements, for collaboration have increased dramatically over the past two decades, and the programs discussed in this paper are just a portion of a relatively long list of possibilities. Rosenholtz (1989) research demonstrates, moreover, that collaboration and collegiality are related clearly to teacher job satisfaction, and, a bit less convincingly, to school quality. However, collaboration is not always a part of teacher training, and, for the most part, it is not reinforced by teachers' predominant experiences. Sustaining mutual dependencies and collective decision-making will be essential for restructured schools.

These constraints make exercising facilitative power to maximize ***human resource utilization*** a leadership essential. Leaders face complicated realities of staff characteristics: (1) not all educational professionals are good at working in groups, either because they have not developed the requisite interpersonal skills or aren't typically prepared for meetings; (2) some individuals have incompatible

personal styles or past histories that make working together difficult; and (3) interdisciplinary groups must have a skill mix and not all schools have all necessary staff specialties. Furthermore, collective activities invoke organizational politics, and existing "factions" may wish to have representation whenever teams are formed, especially where small teams may be making choices that bind larger groups. This often occurs with multi-disciplinary curricula and in alternative schools.

These challenges require leaders to attune themselves to their schools and the personalities and cultures within them. Administrators need not only to match people and their enthusiasms to tasks carefully, but they must also match people to one another so the resulting group is both synergistic, equaling more than the mere sum of its parts, and reasonably efficient. While literature on organizational change argues that voluntaristic participation is one factor that increases the chances of successful innovation, volunteers are not always the best choices for every job. Teachers vary enormously in their desire for participation (Conway, 1976). Moreover, some volunteers spread themselves too thinly; non-volunteers often resist involvement because of an unwillingness to work with just a few colleagues. Administrators need to know their staff and to be reasonably good judges of people if they are to facilitate effectively in the human resource area. Finding and matching people is only part of the leadership role when facilitative power is exercised. Training educators to work more effectively in groups is also part of facilitative power. This may account for the increased attractiveness of organizational development and other group-process oriented approaches in education.

At one level facilitative power incorporates more delegation. At the same time, it requires ***supervision***, monitoring, and feedback. Each of the programs we have described poses new challenges for teachers, and forces them to alter some of the practices they would have learned in preparation programs, observed as colleagues, and carried out themselves. Moreover, they offer results only over the longish-term and have few easily observed outcome measures to reinforce staff commitments. Leaders observe and assess carefully progress and problems, and provide positive feedback and encouragement, especially when staff express inevitable frustration and doubt. In research on successful public alternative schools, Chenoweth (1989) argues that symbolic stroking and "loose-tight" management styles, of the sort described above, account for school survival. Safran (1985) suggests that principal support accounts for some of the variance in special educator self-esteem. Friend and Bauwens (1988), Davies and Dwyfor (1988), and Liebfried (1984) indicate that for mainstreaming the special education consultant needs a great deal of administrative support to foster positive acceptance of new approaches and because specialists so frequently encounter active or passive resistance from other teachers. Sergiovanni (1984) and others have written passionately about schools' needs for symbolic management. This is even more important when staff are asked to take on new types of programs, responsibilities, and challenges encompassing real uncertainties about the future and about their own performance. Finally, programs requiring group interactions have more potential for interpersonal conflict between staff members than those based in classrooms alone. While increased interaction usually builds solidarity and enhances the sense of common culture, interdependencies also generate friction. School leaders in such settings learn to anticipate and manage conflicts, even if the latter requires shifting assignments.

Educational leaders must ***network*** school activities to the outside world. While peer counseling, mainstreaming of special needs students, and alternative schools and multi-disciplinary curricula are hardly new as we enter the 1990s, they tend to be building-based and they do not conform exactly to the common understandings about schools shared by teachers and the public. These programs have an experimental cast to them, and pressures to make them work are strong. To some extent, success requires linking to a wider network than the school building or even the school district. One peer consultation project for instance, was enhanced by frequent contacts, including annual conferences and reciprocity in using in-service leaders (Smith and Goldman, 1990). Staff member were able to share techniques, experiences, and frustrations. District and building administrators facilitated these contacts, lending their presence, their moral support, and their in-service discretionary funds to them. In one British Columbia district, there have been enough peer coaching projects that a district-wide network for principals and teachers has been established (Grimmett, 1987). Organizational development cadre serve the same purpose in the western United States.

Shared information is both useful to those attempting or considering similar efforts and enhances legitimacy in external and internal environment containing many skeptics. Lund, *et al.* (1983) stress the importance of communication between the alternative schools and traditional schools sharing the same site. Any non-traditional program will require increased contact with parents, both because the latter may not understand the program's dimensions and because alternative programs so frequently require parent participation. Teachers carry out most of these contacts, but administrators must often facilitate and filter them, and they will be asked to resolve conflicts and ambiguities.

Networking also generates opportunities. An awareness of similar successful programs elsewhere becomes a source of ideas and support. Publicizing successes, as well as enhancing self-concepts, provides ideas for others. Networks also enhance awareness of resources, whether people or materials. Finally, networks can become consortia, where local resources are supplied or lent to others needing them (Thompson, 1988).

Arranging resources, finding the right combinations of people to accomplish a task, supervising so assistance and support can be provided at the right moment, and networking as needed, then, are key facilitative activities school administrators may already have and know. They will need them for providing leadership as schools undergo restructuring. One way for administrators to judge the potential in a proposal or plan for restructuring, is to assess the extent it increases or decreases administrator's ability to use facilitative skills and facilitative power. If it reduces opportunities to exercise facilitative power, the proposal may be designed to meet political or educational agenda at odds with the main currents of restructuring and reform. Our preliminary effort to provide a framework and checklist for facilitative power may also assist other researchers in determining the extent to which the reforms associated with restructuring and site-based management are indeed different than earlier reform agenda.

References

Abbott, M. G. and Caracheo, F. (1987). Power, Authority, and Bureaucracy. Pp. 239-58 in Boyan, N., ed. *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration.* NY: Longman.

Acheson, K. and Gall, M. M. (1987). Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers: Preservice and Inservice Applications, 2nd Edition. New York: Longman.

Anostos, J. and Ancowitz, R. 1987. A Teacher-Directed Peer Coaching Project. *Educational Leadership* 45 (No. 3): 54-57.

Bacharach, S. B. 1988. Four Themes of Reform: An Editorial Essay. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 24: 484-96.

Bass, B. 1985. *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations.* NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. 1990. From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision. *Organizational Dynamics* 18 (Winter): 19-31.

Bishopp. T. 1987. An Alternative Learning Experience for a Special Kind of Student. *NASSP Bulletin* 71 (No. 516): 116-18.

Bogdan, R. 1983. Does Mainstreaming Work? Is a Silly Question. *Phi Delta Kappan* 64 (No. 6): 427-28.

Brennan, A. D. H. and Brennan, R. J. (1988). The Principal, Ethics, and Special Education Decisions. *NASSP Bulletin* 72 (): 16-19.

Chase, A. and Wolfe, P. 1989. Off to a Good Start in Peer Coaching. *Educational Leadership* 46 (No. 8): 37.

Chenoweth, T. 1989. The Survival of Public Alternative Schools: A Symbolic Perspective. *Urban Education* 24: 93-108.

Clarke, B. R. 1984. The Role of the Principal in Mainstreaming. *British Columbia Journal of Special Education* 8: 247-55.

Conway, J. 1976. Test of Linearity between Teachers Participation in Decision-Making and Their Perception of Their Schools as Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21:130-39.

Davies, J. D. and Davies, P. 1988. Developing Credibility as a Support and Advisory Teacher. *Support for Learning* 3 (No. 1): 12-15.

DeBlois, R. 1989. Keep At-Risk Students in School: Towards a Curriculum for Potential Dropouts. *NAASP Bulletin* 73 (No. 516): 6-12.

Dornbusch, S., Scott, W. R., Laing, J. and Busching, B. 1975. *Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dow, G. 1988. Configurational and Coactivational Views of Organization Structure. *Academy of Management Review* 13:53-64.

Dunlap, D. and Goldman, P. 1989. 'Power Over' versus 'Power Through:' Professional-Bureaucratic Relationships in the 1990s. University Council on Educational Administration, Phoenix.

Dunlap, D. and Goldman, P. 1990. Power as a 'System of Authority' versus Power as a 'System of Facilitation.' American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Fantini, M. D. 1989. Changing Conceptions of Equality: Moving from Equality of Opportunity to Equality of Results. *Equity and Excellence* 24 (Winter): 21-23.

Friend, M. and J. Bauwens. 1988. Managing Resistance: An Essential Consulting Skill for Learning Disabilities Teachers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 21: 556-61.

Glickman, C. D. (1990). *Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach*, 2nd Edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Grimmett, P. 1987. The Role of District Supervisors in the Implementation of Peer Coaching. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 3: 3-28.

Joyce, B. and Showers, B. 1987. *Journal of Staff Development* 8 (No. 1): 22-24.

Koh, W. 1990. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon.

Lieberman, K. E. 1989. Turning Losers into Winners: Integrating Structural Change. *College Board Review*, No. 153 (Fall): 14-19+.

Liebfried, M. 1984. Improving One's Attitudes toward Special Education Programs: The Principal's Role Is Instrumental. *NASSP Bulletin* 68 (November): 110-13.

Lortie, D. 1975. School Teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lund, D. *et al.* 1983. What's Happening in East Williston, New York. *Phi Delta Kappan* 64 (No. 7): 503-4.

Mintzberg, H. 1973. *The Nature of Managerial Work*. NY: Harper and Row.

Muth, R. 1984. Toward an Integrative Theory of Power and Educational Organizations. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 20:25-42.

Pfeffer, J. 1981. *Power in Organizations*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing Co.

Rosenholtz, S. 1989. *Teachers' Workplace*. NY: Longman.

Safran, S. P. 1985. Correlates of Special Educators' Self-Efficacy Beliefs. *B. C. Journal of Special Education* 8: 247-55.

Sergiovanni, T. 1984. Leadership and Excellence in Schooling. *Educational Leadership* 41 (No. 5): 4-13.

Smith, N. S. 1989. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon.

Smith, N. S. and P. Goldman. 1990. Portrait of a Successful Educational Innovation: British Columbia's Program for Quality Teaching. Unpublished manuscript.

Thompson, J. K. 1988. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon.

Tindal, G. *et al.* 1987. Mainstream Consultation in Secondary Settings: The Pine County Model. *Journal of Special Education* 21, no. 3: 94-106.

Trider, D. M. and Leithwood, K. A. 1988. Exploring the Influences on Principal Behavior. *Curriculum Inquiry* 18: 289-311.

Wang, M. *et al.* 1986. Rethinking Special Education. *Educational Leadership* 44, no. 1: 26-31.

West, J. F. and Idol, L. 1987. School consultation Part I: An interdisciplinary perspective on theory, models, and research. *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 20: 388-408.

Whalen, B. 1985. Developing an Alternative High School: Do's and Don'ts. *NAASP Bulletin* 69 (No. 482): 106-109.

Will, M. 1988. Educating Students with Learning Problems and the Changing Role of the School Psychologist. *School Psychology Review* 17: 476-78.

Zigmond, N. and J. Sansone. 1986. Designing a Program for the Learning Disabled Adolescent. *Remedial and Special Education* 7 (No. 5): 13-17.

Table 1. Facilitative Power by Programmatic Example

FACILITATION ACTIVITIES	IEP PROCESS	CONSULTANT MODEL IN SPECIAL ED	THEMATIC CURRICULUM	COMMUNITY/ ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS	PEER CONSULTATION	COOPERATIVE LEARNING
I. Arranging Resources						
. space for activities	o	b	xx	xxx	o	o
. time slots/release time	xxx	xx	xx	x	xxx	x
. support services incl.	x	x	xx	xx	x	x
equipment & arrangements	x					
. inservicing		xx	xxx	x	xx	xxx
II. Human Resources						
. finding people	xx	x	x	xxx	xx	x
. matching people	xxx	xxx	x	x	xxx	o
. training groups	x	xx	x	xx	xx	xx
III. Supervision						
. symbolic stroking	x	xx	x	xxx	xx	xx
. suggestions	x	x	xx	x	x	x
. feedback & reinforcement	xx	x	xx	xx	xxx	xxx
. conflict management	xx	xxx	xxx		xx	x
IV. Networking						
. enlarging group (both) size & composition	x	xx	x	x	xx	o
. helping group "go public"	o	x	xxx	xxx	xx	xx
. linking groups to similar activities elsewhere	x	x	x	xx	x	xx
. diffusing the activity	x	xx	x	xx	xxx	xxx

Goldman & Dunlap, 1990